DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 380 863 EA 026 570

AUTHOR Guzman, Nadyne; Schofield, Rod
TITLE Systemic Restructuring for Successful Inclusive Schools: Leadership and a Collaborative Evaluation Model.
PUB DATE Feb 95
NOTE 41p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association of School Administrators (New Orleans, LA, February 10-13, 1995).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Disabilities; *Educational Cooperation; Elementary Education; *Inclusive Schools; Leadership; Mainstreaming; *Organizational Change; *Organizational Development; Program Development; Program Implementation; Regular and Special Education Relationship; *School Organization; Special Education; Special Needs Students
IDENTIFIERS *Colorado

ABSTRACT

This paper describes the development of an inclusive special education program in 12 elementary schools in an urban Colorado school district. Specifically, the study examined the role of leadership in program implementation. Leadership is defined as a reciprocal, multidirectional, noncoercive influence that involves multiple leaders and followers within a system. Methods included: (1) surveys of 244 teachers and support staff in 11 of the 12 schools, follow-up surveys in all 12 buildings, and a parent survey; (2) interviews with the 11 principals, parent leaders, central office administrators, and the new district superintendent; (3) the development of a teacher focus group; and (4) observation of parent groups and administrators. The school district, in response to recommendations, provided skill training for classroom teachers and support personnel that focused on responding to special-needs students, beginning with behavioral challenges. It also provided skill training in collaboration and communication, initiated team-building activities in each school, and began discussions of issues central to cooperation between regular and special education. (LMI)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

Running Head: SYSTEMIC RESTRUCTURING AND COLLABORATIVE EVALUATION

ED 380 863

SYSTEMIC RESTRUCTURING FOR SUCCESSFUL INCLUSIVE SCHOOLS: LEADERSHIP AND A COLLABORATIVE EVALUATION MODEL

Nadyne Guzmán, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor
Educational Leadership
University of Colorado at Colorado Springs

Rod Schofield, Ed.D.
Director of Special Education
Harrison District Two
Colorado Springs, Colorado

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
N. Guzmán
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Paper Presented at the 1995 CONFERENCE-Within-a-CONFERENCE, American Association of School Administrators, New Orleans, LA, February 11, 1995

EA 026 570

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

This paper describes various leadership implications which have emerged during a study of the planning and implementation of a neighborhood school program for special education students with mild and moderate handicapping conditions in an urban school district. Based upon data gathered during the first eighteen months of a three-year qualitative study of the planning, transition, and refinement process, this paper discusses critical factors affecting the process. The study, which was based upon a collaboratively-planned evaluation, is summarized. Descriptions of the district context and history are provided. The research plan, including the various data-gathering and analysis techniques utilized is outlined. Working theories about essential leadership factors are presented based upon a definition of leadership as a reciprocal, multidirectional, noncoercive influence involving multiple leaders and followers within a system. Emergent management issues are discussed and the school district response to research recommendations is highlighted.

SYSTEMIC RESTRUCTURING FOR SUCCESSFUL INCLUSIVE SCHOOLS: LEADERSHIP AND A COLLABORATIVE EVALUATION MODEL

Within a recent four month period, four major educational organizations -- American Association of School Administrators (AASA), Association of Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD), National Association of School Boards (NASB), and Phi Delta Kappa (PDK) -- have featured the inclusive school movement in their publications. Educational groups in the United States representing both regular and special education have developed position statements which address the continuum of beliefs, values and practices present among administrators, teachers, and parents as they determine the degree of implementation of inclusive education in their particular setting. Court decisions of the past several years have set a clear direction for schools in carrying out the least restrictive environment (LRE) requirements of the Individuals with Disabilities Act (IDEA).

At the beginning of this decade, the Colorado Department of Education reached consensus on guiding principles for the implementation of inclusive practices within Colorado school districts. Among those

guidelines were these statements:

1. School districts must develop strategies to enhance ownership of all students in their home schools.
2. Home school regular education is the reference point in planning for each student.

In response to these guidelines, one Colorado school district formed a task force consisting of 26 school administrators, regular and special education staff members and parents, to consider issues related to home school ownership of elementary special education students with moderate to severe needs. Home school ownership was already a reality in all but one secondary school and became a reality for all schools during the 1994-95 school year.

This paper examines the evolution of this district through the initial stages of implementation of a neighborhood schooling model in its 12 elementary schools. Based upon a collaboratively developed evaluation model (developed by a district committee with local university faculty), a research project was launched to determine essential leadership factors for successful implementation of neighborhood schooling. The study was based upon a newly-emerging paradigm of leadership.

Redefining Leadership

Evolving Definitions

Definitions of leadership have evolved over the years. Early descriptors relied upon traits of selected individuals who were placed in positions of authority and who led others toward achievement of successful attainment of organizational goals (Bass, 1981). Later definitions included behavioral descriptions, relationship patterns, and personality profiles (Gardner, 1990). More recently a broader definition of leadership, one which includes individuals beyond those traditionally given positions of power by the organization, has emerged as organizations have begun to implement collaborative decision making processes and as the culture of such organizations has shifted to accommodate a new management paradigm with accompanying new organizational vision (Guzmán, 1988; Senge, 1990; Rost, 1991). It is clear in leadership and school literature that this definition is in evolution.

Changing Relationships

Through the process of creating a common purpose and focusing collective energy toward desired outcomes, appointed leaders often encounter fear and resistance to change (Guzmán, 1994). Often such

resistance comes on the heels of influence having been exercised in a coercive manner rather than persuasively, allowing followers to freely agree or disagree with an emerging purpose (Rost, 1991). If this is true, the relationship has most likely been developed in a traditional unidirectional manner.

Collaboration in leadership, which includes stakeholders from all levels of an organization or community, is now widely recognized as critical to achieving results. Making decisions by consensus within groups is becoming more commonplace (Oakley and Krug, 1991). Barriers to full collaboration, however, often stem from unrecognized sources that emerge from within or without the system, including role confusion, communication gaps, power differentials, or inability to move beyond self interest. Further complications can arise from various perspectives on what constitutes the common good within a given community (Guzmán, 1994).

Joseph Rost (1991) suggests in his provocative challenge to traditional paradigms of leadership that four essential elements must be present if leadership exists in a situation: 1) the relationship is based on multidirectional, noncoercive influence; 2) more than one leader and

followers are actively involved in unequal influence patterns; 3) they intend several real (substantive and transforming) changes; and 4) together they develop mutual purposes which become common purposes. His theories are supported by others who write about shifts in the paradigm of leadership (Astin & Leland, 1991; Wheatley, 1992; Guzmán, 1994).

A Study of Neighborhood Schooling

History of the District Transition

During several months of deliberation, a task force within one Colorado school district was convened to study local issues and reached consensus on a belief statement: **"neighborhood schooling is a fundamental value and basic right of every child."** They further developed a plan for returning all elementary students with moderate to severe needs to their neighborhood school beginning with the 1993-94 school year. That plan indicated the need for adequate support in each elementary building and specified that individual buildings would have the autonomy within district, state and federal guidelines to determine how best to use their resources in serving students with special needs. The diversity of building plans resulting from this autonomy required the

district to request of the Colorado Department of Education a variance from certain state guidelines to allow for innovative service delivery approaches.

Four committees were developed by the task force for the purpose of addressing four areas of need during the 1992-93 school year in preparation for implementation of the neighborhood school plan in 1993-95: 1) resource allocation, 2) training, 3) service delivery, and 4) evaluation.

The first committee, charged with the equitable and adequate **allocation of resources**, developed a district-wide weighing system in which resources supported the severity of needs and took into consideration the transience of students, regular and special education populations within buildings and the impact of socio-economic levels.

Adequate **training** for school staffs was an early concern. A group of regular and special education staff and parents was brought together early in the process to develop a training package for all school staffs in the district. **Phase one** of the training emphasized attitudinal change through a format that encouraged participants to discover the "value of belonging" as a foundation for neighborhood schools and reflect

on the personal impact of this change. **Phase two** of the training was designed to assist building staff in exploring inclusion and service delivery for their building, identifying needs and developing an action plan. Finally, the **third phase** of training, which is ongoing, dealt with specific strategies for success. Inservices, courses, observations and conference attendance focused on such skills and strategies as cooperative learning, behavior management, curriculum adaptation, teaming and conflict resolution. More than eighty percent (80%) of district schools voluntarily participated in one or more of the training programs.

Another committee developed the following parameters/guidelines for schools to use in determining **service delivery** for special education students:

1. All students will be members of a regular education class.
2. Special education interventions and supports will be provided in general education settings wherever possible.
3. The rule of natural proportion will apply: the proportion of students with disability to non-disabled students within the classrooms should be consistent with existing proportions.

4. Focus should be on the holistic needs of students. (e.g., academic, social, emotional, and health needs will be addressed in an interdisciplinary manner within an integrated setting.)
5. The phrase, "Your Kids, Our Kids" needs to be "outlawed" and eliminated in each building.
6. Friendship supports need to be developed for new students coming home to neighborhood schools to assure a feeling of belonging and acceptance.
7. Staffing teams will assure that home schools are prepared for returning students and that parents are informed of plans that are in place to serve their parents.
8. Building level service delivery plans will be monitored by special education administration.

Schools continue to be in process of applying these guidelines in implementing the neighborhood school plans.

A fourth committee was formed to address the issue of **evaluation**. In addition to the development and review of individual education plans (I.E.P.'s) for special education students with moderate to severe

needs, a decision was made by this committee to join with faculty from the school of education at a local university to evaluate leadership factors involved in moving to the neighborhood schooling model.

In spring 1993 a research study was initiated during the first stages of transition to a neighborhood schooling philosophy and structure in the 12 elementary schools of this urban school district. The study was to be conducted as one piece of a larger evaluation process in a collaborative effort between school district administration and university professors.

At the time the study was launched the subject school district had a student population of 10,704 -- 5886 were elementary aged students in grades K-5 and of those students 578 were identified as handicapped.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to determine, describe, and analyze various leadership factors which might emerge during the planning and implementation of a neighborhood schooling program for special education students with moderate to severe handicapping conditions in the school district. Specific research questions to be investigated were listed as follows:

1. What building principal behaviors, attitudes, and roles exist surrounding the planning and implementation of neighborhood schooling?
2. Does teacher leadership emerge during the implementation, what form does any emergent leadership take, and what is the system's response to any such teacher leadership?
3. Does parent leadership emerge during the implementation, what form does any emergent leadership take, and what is the system's response to any such parent leadership?
4. What factors in central administrative leadership exist?
5. What theories about leadership emerge within the context of the study?

Research Design

This study, which will continue until spring 1995, is based upon a qualitative research design. Because this study was designed and intended to be primarily exploratory and descriptive in nature (Miles and Huberman, 1994), the research process was not rigidly structured in the beginning to allow it to be modified as necessary depending upon the direction suggested by data generated. Early design predicted that primary data

sources would be: 1) structured interviews; 2) unstructured interviews; 3) written surveys; 3) reflective teacher journals; 4) district documents; and 5) observations. Primary subjects would be: 1) elementary school principals; 2) elementary school teachers; 3) central office special education administrators; and 4) the parents of students who transferred to a neighborhood school from district "centered" programs for students with specific handicapping conditions.

The study was designed to utilize various data sources and data gathering techniques which would serve as triangulation to allow for greater validity and reliability in the study (Goetz and LeCompte, 1984; Patton, 1987). The researcher was accepted by the district as a participant observer and primary researcher for the duration of the study.

Building Principals

Structured personal interviews were conducted in April 1993 and May 1994 with elementary school principals. Eleven of twelve principals participated in the interviews. First-year data were analyzed and provided preliminary direction for the next stages of the study, including the content of the written teacher surveys.

Teachers and Support Staff

In May 1993 a written survey was conducted among teachers and support staff in eleven of twelve elementary schools; 244 responses were received. In May 1994 a follow-up written survey was conducted among teachers and support staff in all twelve buildings; 244 responses were received from this survey as well. Likert scale responses from the first year were compared with similar responses from the second year for content as well as for significant changes in item responses. Individual respondents were not coded in any way to assure anonymity; therefore, pre-post comparison data of individual respondents were not aggregated. Comments from the survey were sorted, categorized, and analyzed and compared with other data to determine and support recommendations.

Data from the surveys indicated that, overall, teachers and support staff who responded to the survey responded more negatively on items during the second year than they did the first year. It is important to note that the second year surveys were administered at the end of the first year of implementation, while the first year surveys were given prior to implementation. Specifically, the following issues emerged through the survey data:

1. Responses indicated a decrease in understanding of the goals of Neighborhood schooling in the second year.
2. Respondents reported feeling less prepared to address the needs of all students in the second year.
3. Respondents indicated a lack of adequate training to address the needs of students.
4. Less agreement with the philosophy of Neighborhood Schooling was reported during the second year.
5. Less support for Neighborhood Schooling was reported in the second year.

Conditions within the schools changed considerably during the first year of implementation, therefore the survey data were not intended to stand alone. Triangulation of these data with other sources led to the recommendations and theories reported later in this paper.

Teacher Research Group

Based upon data gathered early in the study, a teacher research group was formed. This group was comprised of ten volunteers who were teachers and support personnel in elementary schools within the district. This group was given training and information about action

research, observation techniques, group process, organizational development, and communication. They served as a focus group for data clarification and kept reflective journals based upon their observations relevant to neighborhood schooling during the 1993-94 school year.

The data from this group were also sorted, categorized, and analyzed with other data from the study. Data analysis is discussed elsewhere in this paper.

Parents

Informal observation of parent groups and unstructured interviews with selected parent leaders have been conducted. In May 1993 a written survey was distributed to parents whose children were being affected by the transition. Data provided was insufficient to support theory generation, therefore another survey is not planned.

This piece of the study has been the most obscure and will be redesigned as other data are analyzed and provide further direction. New parent groups have emerged in pockets within schools and will be studied for leadership implications.

Central Office Administration

Unstructured interviews and informal observations have been conducted with key central office administrators to determine the sequence of historical events, underlying rationale for the project, the evolution of plans, and program expectations. A review of pertinent district documents has also occurred.

A change in the superintendency of this district has been key to subsequent events. An executive expectation that Total Quality Education (TQE) become a district-wide process has been presented. The subsequent implementation of initial team building training has provided preliminary structure for this transition. This shift brings with it implications for the future of building-level teams, collaborative decision making, professional dialogue and planning, team building, and skill acquisition. A lengthy informal interview was held with the new superintendent shortly after he took office.

Data Analysis

Miles and Huberman (1994) suggest that while researchers possess the human skills necessary for finding meaning in the world by organizing and interpreting information, the critical question as to whether the

meanings found in qualitative data are valid, repeatable, and right must be answered. They suggest several tactics, based upon their own work and the work of other expert qualitative researchers, for generating meaning from data and arranging them from the descriptive to the explanatory and from the concrete to the more conceptual and abstract. They offer the following which begin by helping the analyst see which data goes with what, moving the analysis toward identifying what is available, sharpening understanding and differentiating among pieces of data, seeing abstract relationships, and assembling a coherent understanding of the data. The tactics are: 1) noting patterns and themes; 2) seeing plausibility; 3) clustering; 4) making metaphors; 5) counting; 6) making contrasts/comparisons; 7) partitioning variables; 8) subsuming particulates into the general; 9) factoring; 10) noting relations between variables; 11) finding intervening variables; 12) building a logical chain of evidence; and 13) making conceptual/theoretical coherence (pp. 246-262). It is important to note that these tactics are not intended to be implemented in a linear pattern but are used as the data dictates.

Tactics for testing or confirming findings are suggested in the same work (Miles and Huberman, 1994) and have come from the same experience

and research origins. Implementation of these tactics allow for confirmation of data quality, understanding non-patterns, testing explanations, and reality testing. These tactics are: 1) Checking for representativeness; 2) checking for researcher effects; 3) triangulating; 4) weighing the evidence; 5) checking the meaning of outliers; 6) using extreme cases; 7) following up surprises; 8) looking for negative evidence; 9) making if-then tests; 10) ruling out spurious relations; 11) replicating a finding; 12) checking out rival explanations; and 13) getting feedback from informants (pp. 262-287).

Data analysis in this study has utilized selected data analysis tactics from those listed herein and continues to develop as new data sets are added to the growing body of information. Data analysis is not complete at this time, although working theories have emerged and are being validated through the further implementation of various analysis tactics.

Data Implications

While it would be premature to provide specific conclusions at this juncture, several implications have emerged from the data analysis which are relevant to the evolution of the neighborhood schooling project and

which serve as foundational to the leadership implications presented later. These implications will be further refined through the next stages of the study.

Instruction

Addressing the needs of students with more severe handicapping conditions (i. e. physical, emotional/behavioral, or multiple) within regular classroom settings is a primary concern of classroom teachers and principals. As a related issue, addressing the needs of "typical" students within the context of an inclusive classroom is a major concern for that same group.

Broader societal shifts appear to be adding complexity to the regular classroom beyond the relatively few handicapped students who have returned to home schools. Classroom teachers do not differentiate in their concerns among students who were sent "back" to a neighborhood schools and those who arrive in their classrooms with behavioral or learning problems.

Resources

Providing specific instructional skill training for classroom teachers, based upon the needs of a more diverse student population, has

emerged as a need in data from teachers, principals, and central office administrators. An expectation that central office personnel provide skill training, clearer direction for implementation, and additional resources (teachers, specialists, equipment, and supplies has emerged from building data.

Communication

While district administrators purposely called this restructure "neighborhood schooling" to avoid concerns from staff and parents about forced full inclusion, a language shift appears to be occurring from the exclusive use of the term "neighborhood schooling" to the interchangeable use of the term "inclusion." There appears to be no differentiation between the two terms among subjects in the schools.

Dialogue in schools appears to be focused upon student needs, issues of adult communication, adult roles and relationships, time and resource management, and accountability for outcomes. There appears to be no common understanding among groups as to what would constitute successful implementation of neighborhood schooling beyond the inclusion of students with special needs in regular classrooms.

Decision Making

While philosophical acceptance for the underlying rationale of the neighborhood schools transition appears at all levels, practical day-to-day issues remain as a concern. Overall, teachers believe they have no control over their professional lives in the matter of neighborhood schooling and dealing with increased numbers of students with special needs, whether identified as handicapped or not.

Implementation appears to be affected by relationships and structures in place within each school prior to the transition. For instance, some schools have clearer lines of communication and building policies around the issues of students with behavioral problems. Additionally, some buildings appear to have more responsive internal structures in place through which to address emerging student and classroom teacher needs.

Emerging Theories

Several theories are emerging through the integration of data from the various strands of the study. These transitional theories will provide focus and direction for the next stages of the project.

1. Societal shifts and increasing needs of the general school population affect classroom dynamics, teacher concerns, and administrative expectations.
2. The history of communication systems, networks, and practices within each building affects the dialogue relative to the inclusion of specific students within classrooms and the responsiveness of the instructional team to students.
3. Reconciliation of philosophical beliefs with the pragmatics of daily classroom and school life is important to teachers and principals.
4. A common understanding of what constitutes "successful implementation" is important to the success of the restructuring effort.
5. A sense of efficacy through power in making decisions, acquisition of requisite skills, and having adequate resources to address student needs is important to principals and teachers.

Leadership Factor Theories

The evolution of the following theories has taken place over the life of the study and is based upon the definition of leadership presented earlier in this paper. These theories are expected to evolve further as the data are analyzed and expanded. They are also expected to be tested against further emerging data from various sources.

Teachers

1. Skill training focused upon responding to students with special needs (beginning with behavioral challenges) for classroom teachers, utilizing a trainer of trainers model would provide a forum for stimulating professional dialogue, a greater sense of efficacy in the classroom, and an opportunity for leadership to emerge.

3. Formalizing team building and decision-making structures in all buildings, based upon the district's move to a TQE model, might develop a greater sense of efficacy, create opportunities for teacher leadership to grow, and offer an available avenue for revision and refinement of the neighborhood schooling building and district models.

4. Developing a plan and structure at each school to provide for communication around issues of inclusion. Included in that plan might be: group norms, dealing with conflict and stress, clarifying and addressing specific needs, roles and relationships of adults, building a philosophy of addressing a diverse population, reconciling reality with philosophy.

Principals

1. Offering ongoing structured collegial support and professional development opportunities for building principals could provide for stronger building-level leadership teams to be developed. Areas around which those opportunities might be built would include: group norms, community and team building, dealing effectively with conflict, stress management, facilitating roles and relationships among adults, building philosophy for addressing diverse populations, and reconciling reality and philosophy.
2. Providing specific skill and knowledge-based training for building principals around issues of students with special needs would allow for greater credibility in buildings and

could develop a foundation for more effective curriculum planning at the building level.

Central Office Administration

1. Including central office administration on building teams for development of curriculum and structural modifications would develop a greater sense of district community, promote the total quality efforts of the superintendent, and increase communication and understanding of the common purpose among all players.
2. Developing a plan whereby central office administration can become more grounded in the daily reality of schools would improve communication, break down barriers, and increase the sense of efficacy for all players.

In a summary of her findings, Virginia Roach (1994) addresses several critical issues for school administrators that support the recommendations found within this study. Her findings include:

- Superintendents lay the foundation for inclusion in the school district.

- Principals are key in creating inclusive schools.
- Site-based management provides a window of opportunity for principals to create inclusive schools.
- Planning is critical in moving a district toward inclusion, and administrators advise against moving too fast.
- Clear, strong lines of communication are essential in supporting the ongoing success of inclusion, district wide and in individual school buildings.
- Local boards of education can be key actors in creating a district wide vision for inclusion.

District Response to Research Recommendations

An interim summary report of research findings in January, 1993 was used to further develop systems of support for school staff and administration in implementing the neighborhood school program. The school district's responses to specific recommendations follow.

Recommendation A: Provide skill training for classroom teachers that focuses upon responding to students with special needs, beginning with behavioral challenges.

Response A: During the past year, thirty-two different staff

development activities were implemented, the majority of which dealt with specific strategies and practices in working with students with significant emotional disorders. Workshops have been conducted at both the building and district level. In addition, an assistance team, consisting of four certified professionals and one paraprofessional, was established to provide consultation, training, case review and direct services for the purpose of maintaining students with severe emotional disorders in their neighborhood schools. Contract consultants were hired to provide building based training for five schools which completed a needs assessment specifying the type of training necessary for successful implementation.

Recent program developments resulting from district task force recommendations and interagency collaboration further strengthen the neighborhood school model. First, an arrangement has been established with the local mental health center that will provide school based mental health services at the secondary level to the most severe need students and their families. This service, provided at no cost to the district or parents, does not supplant existing school services but enhances the school/community support system for children with special

needs. A second program designed to strengthen the continuum of services for students who present significant behavioral challenges is the development of two elementary cluster sites to provide intensive behavioral instruction in replacement skill training. Selected students will remain in their neighborhood schools in the morning and receive intensive behavioral training at another site in the afternoon for a limited time period. Staff from the afternoon cluster site program will return with the students to their neighborhood schools in the morning to provide further instruction and model strategies for the classroom teacher.

Recommendation B: Provide skill training for classroom teachers and support personnel in collaboration and communication.

Response B: Full day workshops on collaboration and communication were made available to all district staff before the start of school in August, 1994 and again during the district's inservice day in January, 1995. Consultants and district special education staff provided multi-day training for several schools that requested this as part of their school improvement plans. In addition, the district established a working relationship with the University of Colorado, Denver to access a major federal grant that provides extensive training to all paraprofessionals

using a trainer of trainer model. The district's staff development office works closely with the special education department to provide additional training to certified and paraprofessional staff in the areas of collaboration and communication.

Recommendation C: Initiate team building among teachers and support professionals in each school.

Response C: The Superintendent has implemented a total quality improvement process within the district that strongly encourages the creation of quality improvement process groups in each building and the extensive use of team building to support the quality improvement process within each school. The director of special education created a district-wide quality improvement process team with special education representatives from each school. This team, which is similar to those created by the Superintendent for representative certified and support staffs, has identified specific issues related to the neighborhood school program and is applying the total quality model in problem solving these issues.

Recommendation D: Each school might consider developing a plan for communication around issues of inclusion.

Response D: Following extensive discussion of the neighborhood school plan among five large representative groups of regular and special educators over a three month period, the Superintendent in January, 1995 directed all building principals to discuss the issue of regular and special education cooperation with their building level quality improvement teams. These discussions will address issues of conflict between regular and special education, clarifying and addressing specific needs, roles and relationships among adults in the buildings and should assist in reconciling the philosophy of the neighborhood school program with the reality of its implementation.

It should be noted here, that while not all the above activities were developed in direct response to research recommendations, the ongoing research implications and findings related to essential leadership factors gave impetus to the fine-tuning of the neighborhood school program.

This study was intended to be descriptive and to uncover essential leadership factors leading to successful implementation of neighborhood schooling. The researcher was to be involved directly with district personnel without obscuring her intention. This set the stage for what has been described, in their work on naturalistic research, by Lincoln and

Guba (1985, p. 94): "The inquirer and the 'object' of inquiry interact to influence one another; knower and known are inseparable." They further suggest that: "In a very real sense, then, investigator and respondent together *create* the data of the research. . . . Each shapes the other and is shaped by the other (p. 100)." They further describe several options researchers can utilize when addressing this issue of transivity. The best choice, they postulate, is to capitalize on this "mutual shaping" and learn from the process.

It is these continuous, meaningful interactions between the researcher and the objects of the study that yields richer, more "real" data. When that interaction yields (directly or indirectly) changes within the context of the study, they are observed, noted, and reported. If the investigator is simultaneously observing and recording the research process as well, the product should be a more clear understanding of the "reality" of the study.

The district responses noted in this paper may or may not be directly related to the recommendations made by the researcher. That is of little consequence as the responses appear to have occurred as a result of various factors. It is more important to note that the responses have

occurred and to continue the study to determine the multiple contributors, the effects of the responses on the next stages of neighborhood schooling, what occurrences follow, and what other theories subsequently emerge.

Next Steps of the Study

The study is intended to continue through spring 1995. Data gathered in the spring of 1995 will be for the purposes of clarifying and validating working theories and further addressing the research questions. The issue of parent leadership has been elusive and will be focused upon further in the next stages of the study.

Focus group interviews, site visitations, individual interviews, and further document analysis will be utilized in the final stages of this study. The researcher will continue as a participant observer and will utilize the data analysis tactics listed herein to ensure the reliability and validity of emerging theories and conclusions. A final report to the district will be submitted in the fall of 1995.

References

Agar, M. H. (1986). Speaking of ethnography. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, Inc.

Astin, H. and Leland, C. (1991). Women of influence, women of vision. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Barth, R. S. (1990). Improving schools from within: Teachers, parents, and principals can make the difference. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., Publishers.

Bass, B. (1981). Stogdill's handbook of leadership. New York: The Free Press.

Bennis, W. (1989). On becoming a leader. New York: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Inc.

Berg. B. L. (1989). Qualitative research methods for the social sciences. Needham Heights: Allyn and Bacon.

Bilken, D. (1992). Schooling without labels: Parents, educators, and inclusive education. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Covey, S. R. (1992). Principle-centered leadership. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Dana, N. F. (1992, October). Teacher leadership through collaborative action research: Implications for teachers, principals, and university researchers/teacher educators. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Pennsylvania Association of Colleges and Teacher Educators, Grantsville, PA.

Dana, N. F. (1992, November). Discovering researcher subjectivities, perceptions, and biases: A critical examination of myths, metaphors, and meanings inherent in university-school collaborative action research projects. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Research on Women in Education Conference, University Park, PA.

Denzin, N. K. and Lincoln, Y. S., Ed. (1994). Handbook of qualitative research. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Eisner, E. and Peshkin, A., Ed. (1990). Qualitative inquiry in education: The continuing debate. New York: Teachers College Press.

Ferguson, D. L., Meyer, G., Jeanchild, L., Juniper, L., & Zingo, J. (1992). Figuring out what to do with the grownups: How teachers make inclusion "work" for students with disabilities. JASH17, (4), 218-226.

Fetterman, D. M., Ed. Qualitative approaches to evaluation in education. (1988). New York: Praeger Publishers.

Gardner, J. W. (1990). On leadership. New York: The Free Press.

Gersten, R. & Woodward, J. Linking the regular education Initiative: Focus on the classroom teacher. (1990). Remedial and Special Education,11, (3), 7-15.

Giangreco, M. F., Dennis, R., Cloninger, C., Edelman, S. & Schattman, R. (1993). "I've counted Jon": Transformational experiences of teachers educating students with disabilities. Exceptional children., 59, (4), 359-372.

Glesne, G. & Peshkin, A. Becoming qualitative researchers. (1992). White Plains: Longman Publishing Group.

Goetz, J. P. & LeCompte, M. D. (1984). Ethnography and qualitative design in educational research. Orlando: Academic Press, Inc.

Guzmán, N. (1988). The effects of participation in a collaborative planning team on leadership development. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Colorado, 1988).

Guzmán, N. (1993, April). Developing leaders through collaborative planning process. A paper presented at the Conference on Leadership and the Liberal Arts, Marietta College, Marietta, Ohio.

Guzmán, N. (1993). The process of building relationship and common purpose: A study of contributing factors. Unpublished raw data.

Guzmán, N. (1993, January). A study of essential leadership factors for successful implementation of special education neighborhood schooling: An interim summary report. Unpublished report.

Guzmán, N. (1994). A study of essential leadership factors for successful implementation of special education neighborhood schooling. Unpublished raw data.

Guzmán, N. and Earll, S. L. (1994, August). Essential factors in creating a positive school environment. Unpublished presentation for The Institute for Integral Development summer institute, Colorado Springs.

Johnson, B. M. (1992, April). Documentation and evaluation of school restructuring: Dilemmas of a new paradigm. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.

Kline, P. and Saunders, B. (1993). Ten steps to a learning organization. Arlington, VA: Great Ocean Publishers, Inc.

Lincoln, Y. S. (Ed.). (1985). Organization theory and inquiry: The paradigm revolution. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, Inc.

Lincoln, Y. S. and Guba, E. G. (1985). Naturalistic Inquiry. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, Inc.

Loucks-Horsley, S. & Roody, D. Using what is known about change to inform the regular education initiative. (1990). Remedial And Special Education,11 (3), 52-55.

McCoy, K. M. (1980). Interest, leadership, and implementation: Views on the role of the mainstream principal. Education,102 (2), 165-9.

Miles, M. B. and Huberman, A. M. (1994). Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook. (Second edition). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Oakley, E. and Krug, D. (1991). Enlightened leadership: Getting to the heart of change. New York: Simon & Schuster.

O'Neill, J. (1994, December/1995, January). Can inclusion work: A conversaton with Jim Kauffman and Mara Sapon-Shevin. Educational Leadership, 52 (4), 7-11.

Patterson, L., Santa, C. M., Short, K. G., Smith, K. (1993). Teachers are researchers: Reflection and action. Newark, DE: International Reading Association, Inc.

Patton: M. Q. (1987). How to use qualitative methods in evaluation. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Peck, M. S. (1987). The different drum: Community making and peace. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Peck, M. S. (1993). A world waiting to be born: Civility rediscovered. New York: Bantam Books.

Roach, V. (1994, November). The superintendent's role in creating inclusive schoools. The School Administrator, 51(10), 20-27.

Rogers, J. (Ed.). (1994). Inclusion: Moving beyond our fears. Phi Delta Kappa: Bloomington, IN.

Rost, J. C. (1991). Leadership for the twenty-first century. Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.

Sage, D. D. and Burello, L. D. (1994). Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes Publishing Company.

Senge, P. (1990). The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization. New York: Doubleday.

Sergiovanni, T. (1990). Value-added leadership: How to get extraordinary performance in schools. San Diego: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Publishers.

Sergiovanni, T. (1992). Moral leadership: Getting to the heart of school improvement. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., Publishers.

Sergiovanni, T. (1994). Building community in schools. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., Publishers.

Silverman, D. (1993). Interpreting qualitative data: Methods for analysing talk, text and interaction. London: Sage Publications Ltd.

Smelter, R. W., Rasch, B. W., and Yudewitz, G. J. (1994). Thinking of inclusion for all special needs students? Better think again. Kappan, 76, (1), 35-38.

Watkins, K. E. and Marsick, V. J. (1993). Sculpting the learning organization: Lessons in the art and science of systemic change. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., Publishers.

Wheatley, M. (1992). Leadership and the new science. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Inc.

Wolcott, H. F. (1994). Transforming qualitative data: Description, analysis, and interpretation. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.